

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 280 102

CS 505 546

AUTHOR McDermott, Steven T.; And Others
TITLE Adult Product Advertising to the Adolescent Audience:
The Case of Smokeless Tobacco.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Joint Meeting of the
Central States Speech Association and the Southern
Speech Communication Association (St. Louis, MO,
April 9-12, 1987). Contains small print.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports -
Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; *Advertising; Audiences; Consumer
Protection; *Content Analysis; Intermediate Grades;
*Mass Media Effects; Secondary Education; Television
Commercials; Tobacco
IDENTIFIERS *Smokeless Tobacco

ABSTRACT

Prior to the 1986 advertising ban, a study measured the effects of smokeless tobacco advertising on young people. A questionnaire was administered in the spring of 1985 to 133 sixth, eighth, and tenth grade students in rural Georgia. The probability of exposure to smokeless tobacco ads was measured by: (1) the number of hours per week the student watched television; (2) Saturday television viewing (sports programs); and (3) the number of hours spent watching baseball games on television. Credibility and likability indexes evaluated the impact made by celebrity endorsers, and harm/comparative harm indexes gauged students' perceptions of smokeless tobacco as a carcinogen and its risk as compared to cigarettes. Twenty-one percent of the students reported that they either chewed tobacco or dipped snuff. Less than 15% of the females used smokeless tobacco, while 29% of the males reported doing so. Only 10% of blacks in the study used smokeless tobacco. Most students found the ads at least "sometimes believable," and there was a simple correlation between exposure to baseball and use. Both knowledge about Cale Yarborough--highest rated celebrity endorser--and general knowledge of endorsers were related to more use, with celebrity "likability" proving more significant than "credibility." Eighth and tenth graders reported increasing use, and sixth graders with higher exposure to baseball displayed positive attitudes toward smokeless tobacco. (Tables of survey results are included.) (AEW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED280102

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

ADULT PRODUCT ADVERTISING TO THE ADOLESCENT AUDIENCE:
THE CASE OF SMOKELESS TOBACCO.

by

Steven T. McDermott

Leslie Johnson

John E. Hecking

The University of Georgia
Speech Communication Department
Athens, Georgia 30602

and

Charles K. Atkin

Michigan State University
Communication Department
East Lansing, MI 48823

Paper presented to the Mass Communication Division at the joint
Southern Speech Communication Association and Central States
Communication Association convention, St. Louis, April 1987. Direct
all correspondence to Steve McDermott.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Steven T. McDermott

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS505546

ADULT PRODUCT ADVERTISING TO THE ADOLESCENT AUDIENCE:
THE CASE OF SMOKELESS TOBACCO.

By early teens, children show increased preference for "adult" programming (11). Here, they are no longer a target of ads for children's products, but are subject to messages advocating the use of "adult" and harmful products such as alcohol and tobacco. While there has been scientific study on the advertising effects of alcohol and smoking, similar interest on the effects of smokeless tobacco advertising on children has not been evident. This is especially surprising given 1) the harmful health effects of smokeless tobacco use, 2) the large number of young people using smokeless tobacco, 3) the amount of advertising,¹ and 4) the likelihood of significant effects, especially considering the nature of the commercial messages. This survey study provides the first evidence regarding the effects of smokeless tobacco advertising on sixth, eighth, and tenth grade children's use of, beliefs about, and attitudes toward smokeless tobacco.

Like cigarettes, the use of smokeless tobacco is harmful. The use of smokeless tobacco contributes to a variety of health problems including oral cancer, leukoplakia, tooth abrasion and loss, and periodontal disease (9). The World Health Organization declared snuff to be a human carcinogen and in February, 1985, the National Cancer Institute's advisory board stated that the

2

use of smokeless tobacco is causally related to cancer in humans (9). The 1986 advisory committee to the U.S. Surgeon General reported: "The scientific evidence is strong that the use of smokeless tobacco can cause cancer in humans" (9).

Estimates of the number of smokeless tobacco users in the U.S. range from seven to twenty-two million people (13,15). Sales of smokeless tobacco increased annually 11% between 1974 and 1979, and from 1978 to 1984 sales of moist snuff increased from 23 million pounds to 37 million pounds, a 61% increase, while chewing tobacco pounds sold increased 19%. During the same period, dry snuff sales declined 22% and cigarette sales declined 3.6% (14).

Available evidence indicates that the use of smokeless tobacco among young people is not limited to region and has also been increasing. For instance, in a 1981-82 study of Louisiana adolescents (6), the use of chewing tobacco was reported by 44% of 14-15 year old white males compared with 17% for the same group 5 years earlier. Another recent study (12) found that 55% of seventh grade boys in Oregon reported that they had tried chewing tobacco--a number exceeding those reporting that they had tried cigarettes. High rates are reported in both urban and rural areas (3) and not restricted to particular regions of the U.S. (9).

In 1983, the largest seller of smokeless tobacco, the U.S. Tobacco Company, spent 6.2 million dollars on advertising their major product, Skoal Bandits. Of that amount, 74% went for network television ads (10). Although the "Smokeless Tobacco

Council, which represents major manufacturers of chewing tobacco³ and snuff, has a code which states that smokeless tobacco advertisements "shall be directed to adults," shall include models "at least 25 years of age," and who are not actively competing professional athletes nor "professional entertainers who appeal primarily to persons under the age of 18," celebrity and former sports figures--e.g., Charlie Daniels, Walt Garrison, Cale Yarborough--often appear as endorsers.

Studies of other products have demonstrated the effectiveness of celebrity endorsements (5,7). Celebrity endorsement is particularly effective when s/he endorses high social/psychological risk products, which are those products associated with being wealthy, popular and/or successful (4)--a category in which smokeless tobacco may fit. When brand-name and recall are most desirable, celebrities are more effective than experts, typical consumer, or control groups (4). Adolescent audiences may be more influenced than adults. A comparison study of 13-17 year olds and adults (1) found that adolescents were even more positive about the product (alcohol) and more impressed with the the advertisements when endorsed by a celebrity than were adults. Both age groups found the celebrity endorser as generally competent and trustworthy.

In addition to the use of celebrity endorsers, the commercials have other features which might appeal to adolescents. Although formal content analyses of smokeless tobacco ads have not been reported in the literature, Rothrock (10) reports that U.S. Tobacco Company's (the largest seller of

4

smokeless tobacco) advertising campaign has presented their product, Skoal Bandits, as macho and fun, safe, clean, easy to use, convenient, and economical. Thus, the nature of smokeless ads makes it very likely that adolescents are influenced.

Social learning theory (2) also provides guidance in the exploration of these advertising effects. Children may acquire attitudes, beliefs or actual behaviors that are new by adding smokeless tobacco use to their personal repertoire of "acceptable" behaviors. Second, and perhaps more likely, ads may bring about disinhibitions against the use of "illegal" (sale of smokeless tobacco has age restrictions in 34 states), nonsocially acceptable or harmful products such as tobacco. Commercials do not mention age restrictions on the use of smokeless tobacco; rather, famous figures--from sports and other activities that might be especially appealing to young boys--are shown using the product. In addition, these celebrity models legitimize and make the use of smokeless tobacco seem normal--much as advertising does with drinking alcohol (8). Moreover, ads are explicit in their appeal from a celebrity that smokeless tobacco is not only relatively safe but also appropriate when the circumstance and time are not right for "lighting-up." (10).

The present investigation focuses on the acquisition of attitudes, beliefs and behaviors that demonstrate the acceptability of smokeless tobacco use, and on the creation of disinhibitions about the use of smokeless tobacco. More specifically, those characteristics of ads as suggested by

Rothrock (10), are expected to bring about these two previously discussed effects.

The first research question addresses acquisition responses: whether exposure to smokeless advertising is related to greater use, acceptance of use by friends, and general positive attitudes toward users. The second research question examines disinhibition as it is related to exposure: whether exposure leads to perceptions that use is not harmful, and is socially acceptable to use even as a young person. In addition, it is expected that positive attitudes and knowledge of the ads, including beliefs and attitudes about the celebrity endorsers should be related to attitudinal, belief and behavioral outcomes related to acceptability and use of smokeless tobacco.

METHOD

In the Spring of 1985 (prior to the advertising ban), a survey questionnaire was administered to 133 students in the 6th, 8th and 10th grades in rural Georgia. The sample was well distributed demographically in terms of grade (43 sixth, 47 eighth, and 45 tenth), and sex (60 male, 73 female). There were 48 black children and 87 white. In the sixth grade classes, questionnaires were read aloud by the researchers.

Measures

Viewing Experiences: The probability of exposure to tobacco ads was measured in three ways, reflecting a continuum from least to most likely probability. First, the number of hours the student watched tv in a week was assessed. Next, Saturday viewing, a day when smokeless tobacco ads are likely to appear

during sports programs, was measured. Finally, the number of⁸ hours spent watching baseball games, during which the most smokeless tobacco ads are shown at that time of year was assessed.

Four measures were developed to examine the mediation role of the celebrity in exposure effects. Knowledge of the celebrity was measured by using an open-ended question asking the students to identify the celebrities, Cale Yarborough, Walt Garrison and Terry Bradshaw. Answers were coded as correct if they named the sport in which the celebrity participated. Attitude toward the celebrities was assessed with semantic differential scales asking if each was Honest/Dishonest, Knows a lot/Knows a little, Like to be like/Not like to be like, and Like someone like him as a friend/Not... A credibility index was made by summing the honest (trust) and knows a lot (expertise) questions. A likability index was made by summing the like to be like and the like someone like him as a friend items. Believability of the celebrity was measured both directly and indirectly: "Do people really use the product they advertise," and "Do commercials tell the truth?" were asked with Always, Usually, Sometimes, Seldom, and Never as possible response choices.

Dependent measures: Seven variables represent two categories discussed: acquisition and disinhibition. Acquisition measures were designed to examine if a student uses, approves of the use, or approves of the use by others. Use was measured by finding out how often they 1) chew tobacco and/or 2) "dip" snuff and by coding to assess if they did either (a measure of overall

use of smokeless tobacco). Students responded as "Never," "Once a month," "Once a week," "Once a day," or "Several times a day." Use approval was measured by semantic differential scales asking if a person who uses smokeless tobacco is Healthy/Unhealthy, Happy/Sad, Weak/Strong, Ugly/Good Looking, Good Athlete/Bad athlete, and Macho/Whimpy. Factor analysis indicated two unambiguous factors. Healthy/Unhealthy, Strong/Weak, and Good Athlete/Bad Athlete were summed into a general perception of user index. Macho formed its own factor and was used as a single item. Approval of the use by others was examined with a Likert scale for each sex: "It is okay for a boy (girl) to chew or dip tobacco."

Disinhibition measures were those which tapped whether the adolescents thought the use of smokeless tobacco was not harmful, socially acceptable, and alright for children to use. To assess perceptions of the harmfulness of smokeless tobacco use, one series of questions asked if chewing tobacco is harmful, snuff is harmful, whether chewing tobacco causes cancer, and whether dipping snuff causes cancer. A harm index was formed by summing whether they answered either harm question positively and whether they answered either cancer causing question positively. Another set of questions examined the comparative harm of smokeless tobacco with cigarettes by measuring perceptions of whether smokeless tobacco is safer than cigarettes and with a question that has direct correspondence to commercial claims (presented in Likert format): "Pouch instead of Puff means better for your health than cigarettes." All comparative harm questions were

summed to form a comparative harm index. The question of whether children may use smokeless tobacco was assessed with the question: "How old should a person be before s/he chews or dips?"

Demographic items were also included for use in contingent analyses.

Regression were run to determine the relative contribution of independent variable with the dependent variables.

RESULTS

Twenty-one percent of the students reported that they either chewed tobacco or dipped snuff. The average amount of use was once a week. Only 4 students reported dipping snuff. Of the males, 29% used smokeless tobacco, while less than 15% of the females reported doing so. Black students used smokeless tobacco far less than whites (10% vs. 28%).

Students reported watching almost 5 hours of tv on Saturdays, and reported that they watched baseball "sometimes." They had the greatest knowledge about Cale Yarborough, 100 were correct in identifying him and 33 were not, while Walt Garrison was not well known (only 18 correctly identified him).

Cale Yarborough (CY) also had the highest credibility rating, with 80% of the students rating him above the mid point on healthy, nice looking, and good athlete. Over 85% rated all three endorsers above the midpoint on the summed credibility index. Yarborough was also rated as likeable by almost 80% of the sample, while 84% found all three endorsers as likable on the summed likability index. Since CY was the endorser receiving the greatest recognition and had the highest credibility,

correlational analyses were done with him along with the summed indices which included all endorsers.

Responses to the believability index indicated that most found commercials "sometimes" believable; 13% found the commercials to be "always" or "sometimes" believable, 28% found that they were "seldom" or "never" believable, and the remainder were in the middle category.

The correlational findings for the relationships among viewing experiences and the dependent variables are shown in Table 1. Table 2 shows contingent relationships between extent of exposure to baseball and each consequent variable for the demographic characteristics of sex and grade. Since exposure to baseball was the measure most often related to the dependent variables, the most conservative statistical analysis was to enter it first in regression statements before entering the other viewing experience variables.

Insert Table 1 about here

Mass: Significant correlations were found between some measures of four independent variables and whether or not students used smokeless tobacco. There was a simple relationship between exposure to baseball ($r=.365$, $p<.001$) and use, but not between total hours of television viewing and Saturday viewing. Both knowledge about CY ($r=.163$, $p<.05$) and total knowledge about endorsers ($r=.251$, $p<.01$) were related to more use. Credibility of all three endorsers was not related to use, though

overall likability of the endorsers was ($r=.154$, $p<.05$). Specific credibility ($r=.153$, $p<.05$) and likability ($r=.230$, $p<.01$) of CY was also related to use. Believability was not a significant correlate of use. Exposure to baseball was the most important predictor of use (std. beta=.345), with all predictors accounting for 13.7% ($F=20.016$) of the variance in use.

Acceptability: At least one measure of all independent variables, except credibility of the endorser(s) was related to acceptability. Baseball was the only exposure variable significantly related ($r=.372$, $p<.001$). Both specific knowledge of CY ($r=.163$, $p<.05$) and of all three endorsers ($r=.251$, $p<.01$) were related. Likability of CY, not of all endorsers, was significantly related ($r=.165$, $p<.05$). While responses to the query, "Do people really use the product they advertise?" was related to acceptability ($r=.216$, $p<.01$), and the index formed by summing that with "Do commercials tell the truth?" was also ($r=.169$, $p<.05$). The latter question was not significantly related. 13.8% of the variance was accounted for by the variables ($F=20.154$) with exposure to baseball (std. beta=.271) and knowledge of endorsers (std. beta=.156) accounting for the most variance in the set of independent variables.

Attitudes toward users: Excluding measures of believability, each of the independent variables was correlated with positive attitudes toward users. In terms of general attitudes, more exposure to Saturday programs ($r=.183$, $p<.05$) and baseball ($r=.402$, $p<.001$), knowledge of endorsers ($r=.166$, and $p<.05$) both more positive credibility ($r=.484$, $p<.001$) and

likability ($r=.499$, $p<.001$), were all related. Believability was not related. Overall, the independent variables accounted for almost 15% of the total variance in attitudes, but exposure to baseball accounted for the significant proportion of the variance (std. beta=.375). Similar relationships were found for the attitude that users are more macho. Exposure to baseball ($r=.231$, $p<.01$), overall knowledge of endorsers ($r=.199$, $p<.01$), and overall credibility ($r=.157$, $p<.05$) and likability ($r=.214$, $p<.01$) were significantly related, though believability once again was not. However, only 4% of the variance was accounted for by the variables ($F=5.755$).

Acceptable age to use: Exposure was not related to the acceptable age of use. Greater perceived credibility of CY ($r=-.168$, $p<.05$) and overall perceived credibility of endorsers ($r=-.173$, $p<.05$) was related to the acceptance of younger people using smokeless tobacco. The relationship between likability for CY ($r=-.230$, $p<.01$) and overall endorser likability ($r=-.226$, $p<.01$) was in the same direction--with greater credibility, there was greater acceptance of a younger age for using smokeless tobacco. Believability was also related for both overall ($r=-.172$, $p<.05$) and "Do people really use the product they advertise?" ($r=-.172$, $p<.05$) such that more believability was related to acceptance of a younger age for use. Fourteen percent of the variance in acceptable age to use was accounted for by the independent variables ($F=1.823$) with likability as the largest predictor (std. beta=-.262).

Harm: None of the independent variables was significantly related to the perceived harm of smokeless tobacco use.

Comparative Harm: Exposure to baseball ($r=-.214$, $p<.01$), perceived credibility ($r=-.147$, $p<.05$) and likability of CY ($r=-.199$, $p<.01$), and overall likability of endorsers ($r=-.151$, $p<.05$) were all significantly correlated with the perception of the comparative harm of use compared to smoking, such that higher levels of the independent variables were related to the perception that smokeless tobacco is less harmful than smoking. Knowledge of CY ($r=.222$, $p<.01$) and overall knowledge of endorsers ($r=.202$, $p<.01$) was related in the opposite direction: greater knowledge is related to the perception that smokeless tobacco use is not as harmful as smoking. 5% of the variance in comparative harm was accounted for by the independent variables, with baseball exposure (std. beta=.189) and likability (std. beta=.201) as the largest contributors.

The demographic contingent relationships are shown in Table 2. The correlations between amount of exposure to baseball and the dependent variables are shown for low and medium income families, males and females, and 6th, 8th, and 10th grade.

Insert Table 2 about here

Correlations were similar for each sex except for the relationship between exposure and the harm variables, where correlations were larger for males. Males exposed to baseball were less likely to perceive smokeless tobacco as harmful.

The correlations between exposure to baseball and use were highest for older children in the 8th and 10th grade. Acceptability of use was slightly higher for the older children as well, although 6th graders also accepted use with higher exposure. Exposure was significantly related to perceptions that users are macho with eighth graders, but all grades had positive perceptions of users with greater exposure. Sixth graders who were more frequently exposed to baseball were more likely to perceive the use of smokeless tobacco as less harmful than smoking, and as less harmful in general than older children.

DISCUSSION

The effects of the advertising of smokeless tobacco, an adult product, on adolescents are dependent on viewing experiences. Exposure to television, alone, is not sufficiently related to acquisition of or disinhibitions against the use of smokeless tobacco. Although exposure to televised baseball games was related to some of the dependent variables, the relationship between such exposure and effects should not to be assumed to be a function of the advertising per se. Rather, any conclusion about effects must consider the confounding nature of a baseball telecast itself which shows baseball players using smokeless tobacco.

The acquisition variables measured by use of smokeless tobacco, acceptability of use by friends, and positive attitudes toward users were related to viewing experiences. Knowledge of endorsers was the most important correlate of acquisition, but simple relationships occurred between likeability in particular

and credibility for most of the measures. This supports the past ¹⁴ research demonstrating the influence of celebrity endorsers for other harmful products. In fact, credibility and especially likability were substantially related to positive attitudes toward users.

Believability of ads may not be as important for identifying the effect of the ads for harmful products. It did not appear as a significant correlate of acquisition, although there was a moderate relationship between it and acceptability of use by friends.

Exposure, even to baseball, had little effect on disinhibition variables except for a relationship between exposure to baseball and the perception that smokeless tobacco may not be as harmful as smoking. Caution again is warranted against making the assumption that this is a result of the ads. Baseball players do not smoke when playing but some often chew during broadcasted games, thus possibly giving tacit evidence --through modeling--that chewing may be okay but that smoking may not be.

Absolute perceptions that using smokeless tobacco is either harmful or not harmful is not related to any particular viewing variable. Comparative harm was related to viewing experiences, excluding believability and overall credibility of all endorsers. However, knowledge of endorsers led to the perception that use of smokeless tobacco was not less harmful than smoking, while likability was related to the opposite perception that smokeless tobacco use was less harmful than smoking. Knowing about a

endorser does not necessarily require an affective response; likability is affective and such a response should provide the potential for modeling in such a way that the endorsers' advocacy for smokeless tobacco should lead to disinhibitions and tacit acceptance of its comparative safety. In line with this reasoning, examination of the contingent analyses demonstrated that sex was not a distinguishing factor for most acquisition variables, but demonstrated that males with more exposure to baseball, where the male baseball players should be most effective models for boys, found smokeless tobacco to be not very harmful and not as harmful as smoking than did girls. Future research into adolescent acceptance of harmful substances might benefit by exploration of the distinction found and discussed here.

The overall pattern of grade level on acquisition variables indicates that grade is sometimes a factor. The children in the sixth grade who are exposed to baseball are not reporting greater use of smokeless tobacco, yet eighth and tenth graders are. On the other hand, sixth graders with greater exposure to baseball are indicating higher levels of acceptance of other's use and the perception that users have positive characteristics. This may be a demonstration of the theoretical distinction of acquisition vs. performance; younger children may be unable to actually use smokeless tobacco (due to heavier parental or teacher prohibitions and supervisions) but still acquire positive attitudes toward acquisition. In fact, disinhibitions were significant only for the sixth grade baseball viewers.

A simple exposure model is not adequate to account for the influence of adult advertising on the adolescent audience, but perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs about the endorsers are crucial correlates. If the case of smokeless tobacco advertising is even partially typical of other adult product advertising, such as the frequently aired ads for wine-coolers and weightloss pills, the characteristics of the endorsers make these adult products attractive to adolescents.

Notes

1. On August 18, 1986 all smokeless tobacco ads were banned from television. Before that the products were advertised without U.S. government restrictions--except for general requirements against deceptive advertising.

REFERENCES

1. Atkin, C. K. and Block, M. "Effectiveness of Celebrity Endorsers." Journal of Advertising Research, 23, 1983, 57-61.
2. Bandura, A. Social Learning Theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc. 1977.
3. Boyd, G.M. et al. "Use of Smokeless Tobacco Among Children and Adolescents in the United States." Preventative Medicine, in press.
4. Friedman, H. and Friedman, L. "Endorser Effectiveness by Product Type." Journal of Advertising Research, 19, 5, 1979, 63-71.
5. Friedman, H., Termini, S., and Washington, R. "The Effectiveness of Advertisements Utilizing Four Types of Endorsers." Journal of Advertising, 6, 1971, 22-24.
6. Hunter, S.M., et al. "Longitudinal Patterns of Cigarette Smoking and Smokeless Tobacco in Youth." American Journal of Public Health, 76, 1986, 193-195.
7. Kamen, J., Azhari, A., and Kragh, J. "What a Spokesman Does for A Sponsor." Journal of Advertising Research, 16, 2, 1975, 17-24.
8. Maddox, G. The Domesticated Drug: Drinking Among Collegians. New Haven: College and University Press, 1970.
9. Report to the Advisory Committee to the Surgeon General, "The Health Consequences of Using Smokeless Tobacco," 1986.
10. Rothrock, J.K. "Smokeless Tobacco," Report of the Division of Mental Health, Massachusetts Department of Public Health, 1985.

11. Roberts, D. "One Highly Attracted Public," In G. Comstock, S. Chaffer, N. Katzman, M. McCombs, and D. Roberts (eds.), Television and Human Behavior. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978, 183-188.
12. Severson, H. Lichtenstein, E. and Gallison, C. "A Pinch or a Pouch Instead of a Fuff? Implications of Chewing Tobacco for Addictive Purposes," Bulletin of Psychologists in Addictive Behaviors, 4, 1985, 85-92.
13. "Skool Bandit Advertising to Include Health Disclaimer," Tobacco Reporter, August 1984, 24.
14. "Smokeless Tobacco, The Bright Star of the U.S. Market," Tobacco Reporter, November 1983, 68.
15. "U.S. Tobacco Tries to Promote Chewing," Boston Herald, July 8, 1984, 22.

Table 1

Relationships Among Viewing Experiences and Dependent Variables.

	Dependent Variables:						
	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
Exposure							
Total Hours	.083	-.010	-.106	.154	.103	-.020	.089
Saturday	.016	-.018	-.027	.183*	.121	-.023	.039
to Baseball	.365**	.372**	.231**	.402**	-.103	-.100	-.214**
std. beta	.345	.271	.181	.375	-.012	-.079	-.189
Knowledge							
Yarborough	.163*	.185*	.132	.074	.152	-.079	.222**
All Endorsers	.251**	.309**	.199**	.166*	.018	.015	.202**
std. beta	.119	.156	.119	.096	.151	-.026	.022
Credibility							
Yarborough	.153*	.069	.162*	.433**	-.168*	-.100	-.147*
All Endorsers	.101	.060	.157*	.484**	-.173*	-.038	-.087
std. beta	.019	.026	.023	.070	-.085	.027	-.039
Likability							
Yarborough	.230**	.165*	.311**	.471**	-.230**	.090	-.199**
All Endorsers	.154*	.134	.214**	.499**	-.226**	-.085	-.151*
std. beta	.034	.106	.194	.063	-.262	.073	-.201
Believability							
Really use?	.027	.216**	.089	.061	-.195*	-.025	-.123
Commercials tell truth?	.135	.070	.024	-.062	-.095	-.068	.044
Overall	.097	.169*	.038	.073	-.172*	-.055	-.046
std. beta	.162	.094	.061	.072	-.188	-.035	-.021

Note. a=greater use; b=more acceptable; c=perception that users are macho; d=general positive perception of users; e=age when it's alright to use smokeless tobacco (higher number=older age); f=greater perceived harm; g=greater comparative harm. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; R^2 are reported in text. Regressions were run with exposure to baseball entered first, followed simultaneously by knowledge, credibility, likability, and overall believability as predictors.

Table 2.

Contingent Relationships for Demographic Variables for Exposure to
Baseball Programs and Dependent Variables.

Exposure by:	Dependent Variables						
	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
Sex							
Male (n=58)	.384*	.351*	.194	.356*	-.027	-.227*	-.306*
Female (n=69)	.298*	.407*	.255*	.457*	-.108	-.043	-.109
Grade							
Sixth (n=42)	.164	.330*	.159	.431*	.034	-.317*	-.274*
Eighth (n=46)	.418*	.457*	.351*	.491*	.037	-.042	-.185
Tenth (n=41)	.575*	.454*	.199	.336*	-.253	.036	-.205

Note. a=greater use; b=more acceptable; c=perception that users are
macho; d=general positive perception of users; e=age when it's
alright to use smokeless tobacco (higher number=older age);
f=greater perceived harm; g=greater comparative harm. *p<.05;